

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated December 10, 2007, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on March 10, 2008. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 1-34 are pending in the application. Claims 1-34 remain pending following entry of this response. Claims 1, 11-21 and 32 have been amended. No claims have been cancelled. Applicants submit that the amendments do not introduce new matter.

Interview Summary

On February 27, 2008, a telephonic interview was held between Gero G. McClellan, attorney of record, the assistant Examiner and the Supervisory Examiner. The parties discussed the cited references including *Abbott et al.* Claim 1 was discussed. The parties also discussed proposed amendments to claim 1. The proposed amendments are reflected in this response.

During the interview, Applicants argued that *Abbott et al.* did not teach the limitations of claim 1, as amended. No agreement was reached, but the Examiners agreed to reconsider *Abbott et al* in view of the amendments.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by *Abbott et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 7,046,263, hereinafter "Abbott").

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9

USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

In this case, *Abbott* does not disclose “each and every element as set forth in the claim”. For example, *Abbott* does not disclose several of the amended limitations including: “wherein at least some of the rules of the firewall ruleset each specify a different application type selected from a plurality of application types;” and “locating each rule in the firewall ruleset that includes a parameter specifying the particular type of the requesting application; and determining whether the located rules are satisfied; whereby the rules are applied to each requesting application according to its respective application type.” These limitations are present in amended claims 1, 11, 21, and 32. The security mechanism of *Abbott* is directed to security solely predicated on the identity of the requestor (e.g. “present private family information so that it is perceivable only to myself and my family members,” Col. 8, Lines 53-54), and not the “application type”, or any other parameter.

The remaining rejected claims are each dependant from one of claims 1, 11, 21, or 32. As Applicants believe the comments above demonstrate that each of these independent claims are allowable over *Abbott*, Applicants submit that the respective dependent claims are also allowable.

Therefore, for the foregoing reasons the claims are believed to be allowable, and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted, and
S-signed pursuant to 37 CFR 1.4,

/Gero G. McClellan, Reg. No. 44,227/

Gero G. McClellan
Registration No. 44,227
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicant(s)